

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes for the June 23, 2008 Special Meeting

Chairman: Oliver Smith Vice Chairman: Susan Simpson Secretary: Deb Hofler

7:00 pm at the Lilac School Multipurpose Room; Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent Ab=Abstain AI=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use LAW=In Accordance With N=Nay P=Present SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: June 24, 2008

Approved: July 14, 2008

NOV 17 2008

1. Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
SCHWARTZ	SIMPSON	QUINLEY	COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	K. SIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A			P	P	P	P

Notes: Montross and Shoemaker arrived 10 minutes late

Quorum Established: 12

Yes (X)

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Open Forum: Motion: Quinley / Layne - move to the end of the meeting. Caries 10-0-0

4. Announcements & Items of Public Interest:

- Andy Washburn - Related planning group activity summary up to now. [See Appendix 1.] Reviewed the proposed circulation road that would also serve as an evacuation road in case of fire. This road includes West Lilac (an existing road), Rancho Lilac road (proposed), Road segment 3c, Hilldale Road (existing) to Cole grade. Went over the timeline that clearly shows that the Circ SC and the VCCPG never approved or endorsed the road known as 3A. In fact this road will make fire evacuation worse. The VCCPG found out about the SPA through a community member's research not from County Planners.
- Community Input to better understand the opinions of VC property owners and residents on the proposed development. There is a 3 minute time limit per speaker. Speakers are encouraged to complete a Request to Speak form prior to the start of the meeting.

Discussion & Comments:

Larry Glavinic: this SPA is a new community within Valley Center. There is no public transport. No one expects the County to pay for a new road in VC. This Road 3A is not from this community nor solves this community's problems.

Ruth Mattis: This road does not solve our problems...let us rename it 'Horn's horrendous highway'

Anne Geinzer: Opposes this road. This development will drop 3000 + students into our schools. This area has steep grades that make for dangerous roads. We truly need a road from West Lilac to Cole Grade. But this is not proposed. The current roads are windy and dangerous, especially for school buses. An improved Circle R road will work just as well.

Angela Goldburg: You can't put lipstick on this pig!!!! Let's have concentration in one place and feather out. I feel violated that this is happening. This is really bad planning.

Ruth Harber: I live in Couser Canyon. We are avocado growers and have had to cut our water by 30%. The VCCWD told me that they need the revenue from new development.

Lori Kendall: We are under voluntary water cut backs, all of us. How can we have mandatory cut backs but have a SPA for 3000 + homes. GP2020 process is feathering; how is this part of that process? How can this be coincidence that the developer and Bill Horn don't know each other when the developer was busy buying up land before we knew about this SPA?

Todd: Opposed to road and SPA

Judith Silverman: Opposed to the SPA and the Road: This makes no sense for fire evacuation. 6000 cars/one minute each that is two days to evacuate. What about schools? Sewer? Who is going to pay for this? This is an abomination!!

Carol Prime: I can attest that everything that Andy Washburn said is correct. I grew up in El Cajon, and you can see the effects of uncontrolled development.

'Whereas the proposed road 3a does not provide any escape routes for VC residents.'

Jon Vick: Public Trust: get email

Craig Johnson: 'Hornsville' is the beginning of the end of VC. It is the single most destructive development to come to VC.

Rich Rudolf: My name is Rich Rudolf. My wife of 43 years and I live at 14674 Sturnella Way, Valley Center. I was an elected Planning Group Member from 2000-2004. I was an Assistant City Attorney for the cities of Chula Vista and Carlsbad until I retired in 1999.

My themes tonight are "Thanks" and "Fairness":

Thanks to the previous Planning Groups and the huge numbers of Valley Center citizens who worked SO hard on the Circulation and Land Use Elements to produce a pretty darn good development plan for Valley Center's future. Thanks for literally thousands of hours of THANKLESS volunteer work balancing all the disparate interests of business and property owners, Developers, environmentalists, community supporters, and just plain citizens. Thanks particularly to Andy Washburn and the Circulation Committee for creating circulation grids for the sustainable growth of our two Villages, and for providing fire escape routes via Hilldale near the high school and Mirar de Valle from the southern Village to Hidden Meadows.

And thanks for NOT planning a third town center on the West, as currently proposed by Road 3A and its 3000-home, 6,000-car SPA. Please keep it that way!!

Many current Planning Group members were not serving when a wedding chapel was proposed on Cool Valley Road. (It would have required a variance, since it was outside the villages, and in a residential area.) The Planning Group recommended denial of that Project. One major reason was that it would have been grossly unfair to others, who spent time and money to locate such a facility where it WAS lawful and appropriate, and didn't require "Special Favors". Valley Center residents fall across a wide political spectrum, but one common value we all seem to respect is "Fairness." My hope is that this community, and a unanimous Planning Group, will aggressively reject this grossly unfair proposed SPA and Road. It totally undermines YEARS of community planning, and is the product of a process totally at odds with the Board of Supervisors' "bottom up" planning process. It is flagrantly being sold by a "disinformation" public relations spin factory, trying to disguise a huge giveaway as a necessary fire safety measure. Don't reward those who don't follow the planning process everyone else has to follow.

Please say NO to the politics of fear, the cynical manipulation of the citizens. Please DEMAND that Road 3A and its SPA be removed from the Map NOW!

Sandy Smith: I was on the planning group from 2000-2004, and was chair in 2004. I am currently on subcommittees for the GPU, North Village and Community Church.

Myself and dozens of VC volunteers spent hundreds of hours planning the future development and circulation for VC. We worked hard to keep the planned population under 40,000 people. We applied Smart Growth principles in our existing North and South Villages. Planned development in our existing Villages will increase the residential and commercial density to more than we wanted to begin with.

Now this proposal shows up at the last minute, adding another 10000 people and a new 'West' village to our community, and tries to justify itself as the solution to VC's evacuation plan. Who do you think you're fooling!? Let's talk about the road 3A - How will it help anyone get out of VC at all? Why is this small road segment so important? At least 3 other new roads on the map provide better evacuation escapes for the vast majority of existing VC residents and our neighbors. All of the other new roads are more important than this one. This road should not even be ON the map, and it is certainly not our top priority. I want to get from Cole Grade to Lilac Road first!

Then surprise! We need to build 3000 homes around the road to raise money to pay for this 'top priority' road. Using that theory, I shudder to think of how many houses it will take to build the roads that we really need. The TIF program is in place for a reason. TIF funds raised by development in VC go to TIF projects throughout the community.

There's already a too much development planned in Valley Center. If Mr. Horn wants to apply Smart Growth to the west side of VC, then let's go back and review the GPU plans and work it through together. Don't try to slip 10000 more people in at the last minute without involving the community.

Charles Smith: I object to this project: the higher priority roads need to start where people live NOW. If you add more homes closer to the freeway, then subtract 3000 home in the town of VC. It is unfair to add this at the end.

Sam: Lives very close to the intersection of W. Lilac and Lilac Road. In both fires, West Lilac was very well managed, people drove carefully. It took two hours for peak traffic. This proposed 3a is a hoax. The truth is a free road for development. We were deceived as to the purpose of 3a. I resent that. This is an insult to the democratic process.

Hans Britch: The road will destroy my home and dream for my family. We operate a cactus and succulent farm. I am committed to fighting this road and development to keep our family farm intact.

Hans' son: My mom said that if you work hard enough, your dreams will come true. I say stop this road.

Raquel Britch: Thanks to the VCCPG for doing a thorough investigation of this issue. To the rep. of Bill Horn.

The property owners were never notified. The developer was the only one to talk to us. They never mentioned a

road, they said a small development, not 3000+ homes. This whole process has gone horribly awry.

Denise Godfrey: San Diego Farm and Plant Association: We are concerned what impact this road and development will have on our growers. We bring almost \$1 billion to the horticultural industry. We need to make sustainable choices. Where will the water come from? Please vote for the motion, for farming, and for sustainable urbanization.

Margaret: with new development, my taxes increase and my quality of life decreases. Development costs us money. Our infrastructure is 10 years behind. We do not have to grow. We need to sustain current business and industry, not bring in new business/industry.

Jim Quisquis: Over the past months, the PG has been courteous and civil with it's dealings with the County. The reason is that the PG does not want to be adversaries of the county. Then they get slapped in the face. This is not just one Supervisor that did this to us. All 5 Supervisors voted to approve this motion of Bill Horn. We need to solicit the support of other districts. There is strength in numbers.

Phil Church: Something smells funny. I am embarrassed that this type of activity occurs. That the volunteers of this community are treated this way. This is a bottle of shoe polish and shinola. This is a road apple. Can everyone tell the difference?

Jack Fox: get email

Jill Bauer: There will be development of high density surrounded by brush. This is a fire evacuation hazard. This makes no sense for commercial development. Economically, current businesses are having a hard time making ends meet.

Lael Montgomery: **13678 McNally Road.**

8 years >>> **GP Update Subcommittee.** Chair of the **Villages Subcommittee** and **Planning Group Member** for most of this time. Chair of the **Design Review Board.**

Quite a few developers participated **openly** in the GP Update. They showed their plans to everybody who attended these endless meetings, listened to community input. Lilac Ranch improvements to Lilac Road were a factor in planning the Hilldale to West Lilac evacuation route.

- **Not once** in those 5 years did we hear a peep from the 3A developer.
- **NOW we know ... we didn't then ...that**
- Goodson and company **slinked into DPLU** at the **final hour** and got 3A slipped into the Circulation Element.
- 3 months later it's a **critical priority.**
- 2 years later 3000 homes have been crammed into the Referral Land Use Map – all **without 1 second** of public review or input.

This exception has occurred **NOWHERE** else in the County.

- For years the County assured volunteers, over and over, in official documents, in hundreds of meetings, in e-mail, over the phone, outside the loo >>> **LAND USE** would control **future development!** Not **sewers**, not **roads of mysterious origin**, not campaign donors, not connections. No way.
- In **this General Plan** >>> development **density and intensity** would be controlled by the **LAND USE ELEMENT.** Period.
- Traffic modeling to fine-tune circulation would be **based on ... what? On the Land Use Element.**
- This was the **most basic premise** of this new General Plan. Plus all SPAs would be eliminated.

By April of 2006 land use planning was finished.

- VCs map was in synch with our population allocation.
- There was **no reason** to suspect the process would be reversed and that circulation would suddenly drive land use,
- **No reason** to guess that an **unknown developer** had **crept** into the process and deposited a road that wouldn't make sense until later;
- **No reason** to suspect that **any** road segment would produce a ten-fold upzone of the land around it;
- **No way to know** that **two years later** a 1600-acre specific plan area would be **dropped into** the Land Use Element.

The addition to the Valley Center Land Use Element of 3000 homes has occurred without the knowledge, participation or endorsement of the community -- but evidently **under the guidance** of a developer who is accumulating property in the same area. This action undermines principles of good planning, fair play and propriety, as well as the public process and public trust in that process.

It should be reversed.

Debbie Flynn: We have a small avocado ranch. We are here for the peace and quiet. Bill Horn tried to put a toxic asphalt plant in our neighborhood. We found out at the last minute and opposed it. This seems to be a trend. Together we can stop this. Let us fight.

Dana Sildorf: Saw the same thing happen with a development off of Fruitvale. We need to stick together.

MaryAnn Champlin: I used to live in Rancho Santa Fe near the current 610. The supervisors OK'ed San Elijo Hills so that the road can be built. The \$\$ was funneled to Hwy 56. The road was never built. This has happened before, do not let this happen to Valley Center. Stand up to the county supervisors.

Jim Quisquis: Suggests that the PG makes road 3a a standing item on the agenda.

Vankoughnett: I was told that the job of county council was to defend elected officials. So is this appropriate?

Washburn: Is this political?

Rich Rudolf: I think this an appropriate concern and question.

Devon Muto: I leave it up to your judgment.

Coulombe: I support the motion in general but cannot support three of the 'whereas' that are not supports by fact.

Hofler: I would like to remind the PG of the exchange that took place during the November 2006 PG meeting. I specifically asked the county representative about the SPA and he repeatedly referred me to the Aug. 2006 Minutes of the BOS meeting. We have documentation that the developer met with County staff before this. They knew and chose not to tell us.

Motion:

Whereas: The proposed road segment from W. Lilac to Old Hwy 395, currently known as Road 3a was never approved by the VCCPG

Whereas: VCCPG was blindsided by the proposed 1600 acre Specific Planning Area and associated 3000+ home development.

Whereas: Throughout the GP2020 planning process, the VCCPG was led to believe that land use designations would control development, and that traffic modeling would determine road capacity necessary to support the Land Use Element; SPAs would be eliminated.

Whereas: land use planning already met VC's target population, a 110% increase.

Whereas: there was no reason to suspect that the process would be reversed in Valley Center and that circulation would suddenly drive land use, and that a 1600-acre SPA would be created to justify construction of a road to serve that SPA.

Whereas: It appears that the County intentionally hid and renamed the road segment from W. Lilac to Old Hwy 395, now currently known as Road 3A and the associated SPA and it's 3000 home development dubbed "Hornsville" from the VC Community.

Whereas: It appears that the County deliberately kept the V.C. community uninformed.

Whereas: If it had not been discovered by members of the VC community, the VCCPG, the VC community and affected property owners, would still be in the dark.

Whereas: the road now known as 3A duplicates access to the 395 already provided by West Lilac Road.

Whereas: these actions undermine principles of good planning and propriety, as well as the public process and the public trust in that process,

The VCCPG demand that the BOS remove this SPA and road segment from W. Lilac to 395, now known as Road 3a from the map until it has gone through the normal public hearings and due process. Our PG is ready to work with DPLU, DPW, the proponent and VC residents.

Further, the VCCPG specifically requests that County Council and DPLU Staff be directed to investigate the formation of the SPA and road segment from W. Lilac to 395, now known as Road 3A and forward all findings to the VCCPG, to the San Diego District Attorney's Office and to the Office of the California Attorney General for further investigation and legal inquiry into the legality of such process and actions.

S C H W A R T Z	S. S I M P S O N	Q U I N L E Y	C O U L O M B E	W A S H B U R N	R O B E R T S O N	S M I T H	M O N T R O S S	K. S I M P S O N			L A Y N E	H O F L E R	V A N K O U G H N E T	S H O E M A K E R
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------	----------------------------	---	---

Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A			Y	Y	Y	Y
Maker/Second: Hofler/S.Simpson								Carries: 12 – 0 – 0						
Notes:														
c)		Oliver Smith discussed the different maps that will be presented to the B.O.S.: DPLU Draft map, referral map, hybrid map, environmentally superior map. How can we go about this the right way? The VC web site. www.VCCPG.org . Contact the VCCPG, look to citizen committees and other groups. What about the Planning Commission: They saw the maps about two weeks ago.												
5.		Open Forum:												
a)		Anne Geinzer: Would like a standing ovation for the VCCPG for their courage.												
b)		Jack Fox: SOFAR: Save Our Farms and Ranchlands would like to be contacted.												
c)		Would like to see VC incorporated so that we are responsible for our own future.												
6.		Motion to Adjourn:												
Maker/Second: Quinley/ Schwartz								Vote:12-0-0						
Notes:														

Appendix 1:

Road 3A - Background Information

Valley Center Community Planning Group's Activities Regarding Road 3A

Definitions

VCCPG = Valley Center Community Planning Group

Circulation SC = Circulation Subcommittee of the VCCPG

BOS = County of San Diego Board of Supervisors

DPLU = County of San Diego's Department of Planning and Land Use

GP2020 = County's effort to update the County's General Plan

Circulation Element = the portion of the General Plan focusing on transportation

Road Network Planning map and matrix = the documents maintained by DPLU to facilitate work on Valley Center's Circulation Element Road Network

Road 3A = Current name of a segment on the Road Network Planning map and matrix connecting West Lilac Road at about Running Creek Road to Old Highway 395, north of Nelson Way. Initially this segment was named Segment 3C.

Timeline

Date	Event	Importance	Source Document(s)
May 18, 2005 thru April 6, 2006	Circulation SC meetings	"GP2020 Road Network Planning" discussed during at least 10 meetings. Road 3A unknown.	Circulation SC minutes
Sept. 10, 2005	Saturday Community Workshop	GP2020 Road Network Planning Workshop at Valley Center Middle School. Road 3A not discussed or shown on maps.	Handouts
March 30, 2006	Circulation SC meeting	Bob Citrano, DPLU, presents latest version of map and matrix. No Road 3A.	Large maps and matrix
April 3, 2006	New map and matrix from DPLU	Includes input from March 30 meeting. No Road 3A on matrix.	DPLU's "GP2020 Road Network Planning" matrix, dated April 3, 2006

April 6, 2006	Circulation SC meeting	Members create recommendations for the planning group. No Road 3A.	Circulation SC minutes
April 7, 2006	DPLU creates revised map and matrix	No Road 3A on matrix.	DPLU's "GP2020 Road Network Planning" matrix, dated April 7, 2006
April 10, 2006	VCCPG meeting	Bob Citrano, DPLU, presents latest map and matrix (dated April 7, 2006). Circulation SC recommendations are presented. No Road 3A on map or matrix.	VCCPG minutes
April 24, 2006	VCCPG Special Meeting on Road Network Planning	The matrix handed out at the meeting lists 3C (New Road) West Lilac to Old Highway 395 via Nelson Way. (Documents are dated April 24, 2006.) Road 3C was later renamed Road 3A	DPLU's "GP2020 Road Network Planning" matrix, dated April 24, 2006

Frequently Asked Questions

Question #1: Did the Circulation Subcommittee endorse Road 3A as part of Road Network Planning?

No. The Circulation SC spent over six months working on Road Network Planning. DPLU did not mention Road 3A. DPLU added Road 3A to the plan after the Circulation SC had completed its work and had forwarded its recommendations to the VCCPG.

Question #2: Did the VCCPG know about Road 3A before the Special Meeting on April 24, 2006, which was the meeting called to finalize the Road Network Plan and vote on it?

No.

Question #3: Did the VCCPG include Road 3A in the Road Network Plan that it endorsed at the Special Meeting on April 24, 2006?

No. The motion that passed at the meeting endorsed the April 7, 2006 version of the Road Network Plan which does not include Road 3A.

Question #4: Does the VCCPG favor an east-west route from the Cole Grade area to I-15?

Going back to 2002 and further, the VCCPG has requested the County construct an east-west route from the Cole Grade area to I-15.

Question #5: As part of GP2020 Road Network Planning, did the VCCPG endorse an east-west "escape" route from the Cole Grade area to I-15?

Yes. The proposed route is: west from Cole Grade on existing Hilddale Road, then paralleling Keys Creek (new construction), then through Rancho Lilac on the "Main" Road (proposed) to West Lilac Road, and finally northwesterly on West Lilac Road to Old Hiway 395 or to I-15.

Question #6: Is Road 3A critical to the proposed westerly "escape route" from the Cole Grade area?

No. It duplicates one of the existing segments (West Lilac Road). The connection between Hilddale Road and Rancho Lilac is far more critical.

